

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-14, 16-27, 29-37, 39-43, and 46 are currently pending in this application.

### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-8, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,898,762 to Ellis et al. (hereinafter, merely “*Ellis*”) in view of UK Patent Application No. 2343074 to Miller et al. (hereinafter, merely “*Miller*”), U.S. Patent No. 7,469,413 to Mizutome et al. (hereinafter, merely “*Mizutome*”), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,437,836 to Huang et al. (hereinafter, merely “*Huang*”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,210,100 to Berger et al. (hereinafter, merely “*Berger*”).

Claims 9, 14, 16-20, and 22-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Huang* in view of *Miller*, *Mizutome*, and *Berger*.

Claims 10-13 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Huang* in view of *Miller*, *Mizutome*, and further in view of *Berger* and *Ellis*.

Claims 29, 31-37, 39-40, and 42-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over

*Ellis* in view of *Miller*, *Mizutome*, and further in view of *Huang* and *Berger*.

### III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

An information processing system comprising:

...

**convertor means coupled to said storing means and providing means, said convertor means converting, under control of said providing means, said program information retrieved from said storing means from a page description language format structured hierarchically using tags to another database format that excludes said tags, wherein said another database format comprises a less amount of data than said page description language and requires no data analysis following retrieval, ... (Emphasis added)**

Neither *Ellis*, *Miller*, *Mizutome*, *Huang*, nor *Berger*, taken either alone or in combination, disclose or render predictable the above-identified features.

Specifically, Applicants note that the Office Action concedes that *Ellis*, *Miller*, *Mizutome*, *Huang* fail to teach or suggest or render predictable “**convertor means coupled to said storing means and providing means, said convertor means converting, under control of said providing means, said program information retrieved from said storing means from a page description language format structured hierarchically using tags to another database format that excludes said tags, wherein said another database format comprises a less amount of data than said page description language and requires no data analysis following retrieval**” and instead relies on *Berger* (see page 7 of the pending office action).

Specifically, the Office Action contends that the above recited features of Applicants’ claim is taught by *FIGS. 1 and 13*, and *column 10, line 43 through column 11, line 54* of *Berger*. Applicants respectfully disagree based on at least the following:

According to *column 11, lines 12-15 of Berger*, the “content transformation systems can use automatic document segmentation to stage the delivery of large documents to devices incapable of processing large documents in their entirety.”

**Therefore, *Berger* does not convert program information from a page description language format to another database format that requires no data analysis following retrieval**

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of prior art **lacks motivation** and is a result of **improper hindsight**. The Office Action appears to have pieced together a mosaic of features from each of the references. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable. Independent claims 5, 7, 9, 26-27, 29, 36-37, 39, and 42-43, which are similar in scope to claim 1, are also patentable for similar reasons.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.

#### **IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800